

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/697,826	10/30/2003	Young-Gun Ko	SAM-0449	9264	
7	590 07/27/2005	EXAMINER			
Anthony P. Onello, Jr.			CRANE, S	CRANE, SARA W	
MILLS & ONELLO LLP Suite 605			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Eleven Beacon Street			2811		
Boston, MA	02108		DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005	DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				A			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	717			
	•	10/697,826	KO ET AL.				
C	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Sara W. Crane	2811				
Th Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ess			
A SHORT THE MAIL - Extensions after SIX (6 - If the perioc - If NO perior - Failure to re Any reply re earned pate	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1:) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If or reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we pply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute exceived by the Office later than three months after the mailing ent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status							
1)⊠ Res	ponsive to communication(s) filed on 19 M	<u>ay 2005</u> .					
2a)☐ This	action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.					
•	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
clos	ed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition o	f Claims						
4)⊠ Clai	m(s) 1-92 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) (Of the above claim(s) <u>1-26 and 47-71</u> is/are	withdrawn from consideration.					
5)∐ Clai	m(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Clai	m(s) <u>27-46 and 72-92</u> is/are rejected.						
.7)∏ Clai	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)∏ Clai	m(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application F	Papers						
9) <u></u> The	specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) <u></u> The	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
App	licant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Rep	lacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	jected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).			
11) <u></u> The	oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO	-152.			
Priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Ackr a)⊠ Al 1.⊠	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·)-(d) or (f).				
2.			on No.	•			
3.				age			
	application from the International Bureau			· ·			
* See t	he attached detailed Office action for a list	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ed.				
			·				
Attachment(s)							
	References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of D	Oraftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
	n Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) s)/Mail Date <u>26 N</u> oJ. 2002	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-1	52)			
	1050			•			

Application/Control Number: 10/697,826

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claims should probably depend from claim 30, where the "second source/drain regions" are recited. (?)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 27-37, 41-43, 45-46, 72-83, 87-89, and 91-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama.

With respect to claim 27, figure 10 of Nishiyama teaches a MOS transistor having a gate dielectric 204, 208, on substrate 202, and gate electrode 216 on the gate dielectric. Layer 210, 212 is adjacent (or nearby) the gate dielectric layer at the lower portions of the gate electrode, and there are insulating spacers (part of layer 215) on layer 210, 212 at an upper side portion of the gate electrode. It would have been obvious to make layer 210, 212 as an epitaxial layer, because a selective epitaxial

growth deposition process is taught (column 12, lines 32-35), in order to obtain the high quality crystallinity which would arise.

With respect to claim 28, layers 205, 208 wrap around the gate electrode. Doped regions form "first" source/drain regions at 210, 212, and "second" source/drain regions are below at 213, 214, extending into the substrate. The semiconductor is silicon (column 12, line 36). Silicon oxide would have been obvious for gate dielectric, because this is the most commonly used material for this purpose, and it must be either deposition or grown by oxidation. Conductive materials of claims 43 and 45-46 would have been obvious to increase the conductivity of a contact or electrode, and silicides as noted are in addition refractory.

Claims 38-40 and 84-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama in view of Liu.

It would have been obvious to provide a recessed channel as shown in the cover figure of Liu in the Nishiyama device, in order to decouple shallow junctions, as noted in for example the Liu abstract. It would have been obvius to optimize the trench depth, consistent with other device dimensions, i.e., a small device would have small dimensions.

Claims 44 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama in view of Lee et al.

Art Unit: 2811

An oxide sidewall buffer, such as Lee et al. 27 (column 3, line 55) would have been obvious for the Nishiyama device, in order to provide improved dielectric constant, or for enhanced isolation, in order to isolate the gate electrode from adjacent conductors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Crane, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1652.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sara W. Crane
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2811